Process – Follow-up to Testing

5. Teacher Evaluation Survey

6. Focus Group Minutes and

   Summary/Analysis

7. Protocol Analysis – Rescoring and

   Comments

8. Frequently Asked Questions

Teacher Evaluation of the AK Alternate Assessment Pilot Administration and Scoring

Teacher Name_____

Student Name_____

Subject Area (circle one): Reading – Writing – Mathematics [copy and complete foe each]

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. The materials were easy to access on the web site.				
2. I was able to print them out without any difficulty.				
3. The quality of the copy was clear for the student.				
4. The materials were easy to organize for the administration.				
5. I was able to provide appropriate accommodations for the student.				
6. The student was attentive during the administration.				
7. I was able to pace the administration appropriately for the student.				
8. I was able to easily score the student responses.				
9. The results from this assessment adequately reflect the skill of the student.				
Time	30-60 minutes	61-90 minutes	91-120 minutes	121-150 minutes
10. About how much time did it take you to *administer* the test?				
11. About how much time did it take you to *score* the test?				
12. About how much time did it take you to *enter the data* into the computer web site?				
13. Comments:				

Teacher Evaluation of Alternate Assessment Pilot

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Deviation
1. MatAcc	54	1	4	3.56	.769
2. Print	54	2	4	3.61	.596
3. QualCop	54	2	4	3.61	.564
4. MatOrg	52	1	4	3.23	.757
5. AppAcc	51	2	4	3.22	.577
6. StAtt	54	2	4	3.37	.560
7. PaceApp	54	2	4	3.54	.539
8. ScrResp	51	2	4	3.33	.653
9. PerfRef	54	1	4	3.20	.786
10. TAdm	54	15	120	40.28	22.158
11. TScore	54	2	600	41.80	78.210
Valid N (listwise)	46				

Frequencies

1. MatAcc

Valid		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid	1	3	5.6	5.6	5.6
	3	15	27.8	27.8	33.3
	4	36	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	54	100.0	100.0	

2. Print

Valid		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid	2	3	5.6	5.6	5.6
	3	15	27.8	27.8	33.3
	4	36	66.7	66.7	100.0
	Total	54	100.0	100.0	

3QualCop

Valid		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid	2	2	3.7	3.7	3.7
	3	17	31.5	31.5	35.2
	4	35	64.8	64.8	100.0
	Total	54	100.0	100.0	

4. MatOrg

		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid	1	3	5.6	5.8	5.8
	2	1	1.9	1.9	7.7
	3	29	53.7	55.8	63.5
	4	19	35.2	36.5	100.0
	Total	52	96.3	100.0	
MissingSystem		2	3.7		
Total		54	100.0		

5. AppAcc

		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid	2	4	7.4	7.8	7.8
	3	32	59.3	62.7	70.6
	4	15	27.8	29.4	100.0
	Total	51	94.4	100.0	
MissingSystem		3	5.6		
Total		54	100.0		

6. StAtt

		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid	2	2	3.7	3.7	3.7
	3	30	55.6	55.6	59.3
	4	22	40.7	40.7	100.0
	Total	54	100.0	100.0	

7. PaceApp

		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid	2	1	1.9	1.9	1.9
	3	23	42.6	42.6	44.4
	4	30	55.6	55.6	100.0
	Total	54	100.0	100.0	

8. ScrResp

		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid	2	5	9.3	9.8	9.8
	3	24	44.4	47.1	56.9
	4	22	40.7	43.1	100.0
	Total	51	94.4	100.0	
MissingSystem		3	5.6		
Total		54	100.0		

9. PerfRef

		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid	1	3	5.6	5.6	5.6
	2	3	5.6	5.6	11.1
	3	28	51.9	51.9	63.0
	4	20	37.0	37.0	100.0
	Total	54	100.0	100.0	

10. TAdm

		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid	15	1	1.9	1.9	1.9
	30	40	74.1	74.1	75.9
	60	9	16.7	16.7	92.6
	90	2	3.7	3.7	96.3
	120	2	3.7	3.7	100.0
	Total	54	100.0	100.0	

11. TScore

		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid	2	1	1.9	1.9	1.9
	5	1	1.9	1.9	3.7
	30	48	88.9	88.9	92.6
	60	2	3.7	3.7	96.3
	90	1	1.9	1.9	98.1
	600	1	1.9	1.9	100.0
	Total	54	100.0	100.0	

12. TData

		Frequency	%	Valid %	Cumul. %
Valid		3	5.6	5.6	5.6
	2	1	1.9	1.9	7.4
	30	46	85.2	85.2	92.6
	5	1	1.9	1.9	94.4
	less/30	3	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	54	100.0	100.0	

5/11/06 4:30pm
AK conference call

Aran Felix- thanks for participating in the pilot. Purpose is to learn from the participants what worked during the pilot and what needs improvement so we can make it operational next year.

Roll Call

Jerry- explains logistics of call to be most effective, thanks for participation

Pat Almond- had really good turnout. Say your name and make comment. Time is limited and number of people on call, want to hear from everyone who has something to say. A couple of days ago I sent out reminder of the call with an attachment. IF you have that attachment I can describe and you can make notes. Purpose of call is to get information from you about what works, and what needs fixing. People had questions about policy things. We're also tracking what kind of questions we get. Table: Pilot component, things to continue, things to change, questions to answer. Allowed about 15 minutes for each topic and a little more on test administration. Face to face component, we might have comments about materials, the presentation, online training, qualifying, issues about time and flexibility. I'd like to open it up to start with id anything about the process, anything about the training program that works.

Wayna Freeman- really felt the online training I received was very effective for me and very efficient, I had the opportunity to work on it when I had peace and quiet and could focus and that was good.

Katy- I liked having the face to face intro, the online training I know for me and Parrish, the huge factor for us, it would have been nice for us to have a day up in Anchorage to do the training, a day away from everything to do the training.

Rebecca- online worked well for me, good to have initial meeting, helped me to go through by myself when time allowed, did take a lot of time but practice tests were good.

Regina- agreed, I liked the face to face, being able to work on it when I could

Nebzeroff- liked the fact that we did 2 different types of training, a few of the video clips that weren't compressed, I wasn't' able to access them. You might want to double check. And heads up that fire fox worked better for a browser can't do with dial-up.

Pat- couple things I'm hearing on improvement, be clear on what works and doesn't work on software that needs to be loaded, no dial up, compress the videos.

Jill Rampony- I agree with statement it would have been nice to have 2 days to do training, I have a concern when we are training our teachers, if we just do a 1 day training and send them off, this is a lot of time to be putting in. Try to connect it up with type of

credit as an incentive. Then it could be done on a Sat. also. On the proficiency exam, I really had a couple I disagreed with the answer. I don't know if anyone else found that. There were a couple where the administrator was clearly giving the answers and then erasing the answers for the student. When taking the test it was said that was appropriate, don't know if that's right.

Freeman- experienced same thing, don't know if I didn't understand questions. I also disagreed with several scores the first time. Talking about the RWM

Jill- made copies and questions I had on those. I can e-mail specific ones and the questions I had concerns on.

Pat- the more specific the feedback the better we can do.

Chris- The face to face training I found very good and the online training. I liked I could do it in individualized chunks, and had it available to go back and refer to specific training. Admin. I really struggled with, wasn't really able to figure out criteria for appropriate and not appropriate. Overall very well organized.

Rachel- frustrated downloading videos. Ended up having to go to public library because our band wasn't wide enough. Don't know if anyone else had same problem.

Regina- had some problem with videos- took a long time. Admin. Saying something was appropriate when it wasn't, I'm sure was the same concern others are referring to.

Pat- Time was a big factor. Hearing maybe extra day in computer lab would be part of solution, other part, was helpful to do it on own time. Connectivity with bandwidth, software. Issues we need to get answers to. Maybe some current work with computer tech group to make sure system will operate in future. That seem right?

Yes

Beth- I'm wondering if there's any way you can put it on a CD or set of CDs. Eliminate internet connections completely, then just have to score it some other way. Kind of be on an honor system.

Pat- kind of suggestions that are helpful to us. Anybody else have some thoughts?

Rebecca- I know some districts are using pod caps. Videos may be put on pod cast type format, but it would still require internet.

Jerry- what we will be doing is compressing the video files, will help solve the big problems. The admin. We've got consistent feedback something is scored wrong. Any other comments you have mark it up and send it as an e-mail and we'll try to solve it.

Pat- one other thing I heard, because we're at the beginning, I heard people anticipating conducting the training in the districts and coordinating materials, new assessors dealing with the training. Are there other thoughts people have about being responsible for training other teachers, other materials we can prepare over the summer, things we can do to conduct the training.

Jill Rampony- don't know if 'm in the next section, student materials. In thinking of the training, what I would recommend is that person who does training, go into training with hard copy manuals of what everyone has to download. I found that time consuming, for each teacher to copy all manual, cut all flashcards, laminate flashcards, really a time consuming thing to do. What I thought, I would like to have manuals ready for everyone so they have those.

Pat- thinking of some way to expedite the process of hands on materials.

Jill- I don't think this is something you should do, as a mentor I would have to suggest this to my school district.

Pat- why don't we plan on having another focus group. How to make being a mentor feasible and doable. Any other comments about that?

Chris- I think that's an excellent idea. I'm having trouble with my connection, I don't know if there's a problem with the connection or what.

Regina- mine just dropped also

Rachel- Fairbanks, had to dial back in also

Jerry- also had to dial back in.

Rebecca- had to dial back in also

Chris- couldn't hear pat very well at all.

Hearing feedback, echo from some but not everyone.

Pat- pilot admin, talking about materials and the manual directions. Can we move ahead to that?

Sure , yes…

Pat- again trying to answer a few questions, what is working, what's not, any questions to have successful implementation next year. Directions for admin, student materials for protocol, descriptions for ratings, concerns about what was accommodation, modification, administration proficient or inappropriate. Launch into that piece with things that worked, need to be changed. Start with directions for admin.

Chris- found directions very clear, I think they were good.

Jill- agree, looking at list didn't have opportunity because only had 1 student who did lower part of list, accommodation and modification everything went really well, enjoyable experience.

Regina- agrees, clear and concise, student enjoyed doing it, looking at different things.

Like decisions guides, thought that was helpful.

Chris- part on accom/mod. St I tested I didn't use section with, but person I will be using next year I'm worried that it will be as clear.

Linda- gave test to high functioning student, concerned about mod. Almost that the practice tests were overkill. And only concern was there was confusion on my part and Missy who gave it here, where we put the scores in, not the actual score itself, some pages were one way, some the other ways.

Pat- anyone have student who could not response and use checklist.

Beth- my student couldn't respond and thought checklist was quite appropriate.

Pat- provided way to not score student 000

Beth- thought is was adequate

Pat- what kind of things are important.

Beth- would break down communications to more discreet levels.

Pat- might be another area for focus group. We have some ideas for improvement, so if anyone has ideas for checklist, we will be using it another year to understand students out there. Jerry/Aran, any thoughts on decisions for proficient, not proficient.

Jerry- earlier comment was appropriate. We want to access skill and they have different ways to approach assessing skill, want to be sensitive to fact there are other ways to assessing kids, want to surround it with support, examples.

Struggled with student, fine motor needs, hard to accommodates. I have him use adaptive device to write. If I could have had him copy letter, would have been a lot clearer, but didn't seem to sit with the task. Had him try to copy, it was so difficult to him, he didn't have reversals, so I scored him well. Didn't address poorly formed letters, I made my own decisions on if this was good for him. Felt uncomfortable, more discussion would be good.

Rebecca- add to survey check list- mine was higher functioning, I think it works well for these kids. Worried about lower functioning kids, seems like there should be something more then checklist to accommodate for those students.

Another thing I really liked in assess we're getting rid of, is the present levels of performance, description of the kids. That I could put down the fine motor, don't know if that would be helpful, but I felt like I wanted to be able to describe my students. Maybe that's a component that's helpful to more than just me.

Pat- any thoughts about challenges when training others as a mentor? Being able to answer questions for others?

Donna- did 2.5 kids. One low functioning, one higher. Lower functioning would like to have lists that if this happens, try this, of accom/mod that I could try. He did like it, and he poured a lot of 0's, but I kept thinking what else can I do? Qs on how to score different kinds of disabled kids.

Terry- one of things for students required to take test, we're not supposed to provide accom if they're not using in classroom. Wondering it that's not valid for kids on this alternate assess too. Do we really want to see what their skills are at this time, and later on could come up with accom that would help them perform better, I could be wrong.

I agree it wouldn't be time to introduce, but our state does have a list of acceptable accom teachers can use when it comes to testing time, things that are in students IEPs

Jerry- agree, try to provide range of examples so people could understand possibilities principles behind it.

What is acceptable, not acceptable. Be good to know.

JT- examples to drive the principles.

Pat- any other ideas about things we can do to provide supportive materials for mentoring?

Terry- is video component going to be part of training modules for new teachers? Is going to be used by mentors?

Pat- need feedback from you, you would deal with assessors same way we dealt with you. Some face to face, be able to answer questions as they went through training.

Aran- Plan is that mentors would go through same routine with teachers to bring up to qualified assessor level. Good to have in a room for part of that training. You found out how busy life gets.

Terry- concern then that we take care of some of glitches with video and online training. Felt frustrated at times because admin proficiency I was giving + and – and finally just clicking on any old thing to get through it because I had no idea what would be right or wrong.

Aran- did you document any others you had problems with.

Terry- Other than temper tantrum on floor, no.

Linda- took forever to download any of videos. Assuming that is being worked on.

Rebecca- part of problem of counting words and letters, reading part, I did those and it said proficient, and then not. So that's the problem I was having.

Chris- that part where you had to do counting of spaces between and words and letters, going to be most difficult as trainers to teach that because it was hard and confusing. Online training was excellent, fact I could go back and re-do it was good, but that section as a trainer for me is going to be difficult.

Terry- going to let us know, give us feedback on scoring?

Jerry- yes, going through with colored highlighter to see where differences exist. We know some algorithm screwed up. Other proficiencies we'll go through with fine toothed comb so you don't have trouble when training. Videos will be pulled half size. Come summer, we might have some of you who had major problems with video downloads, try out after we fix.

Pat- coming toward end of hour, ended up back on online system. Think queistions have to do with navigation, action we would like some feedback on. Access, connectivity, seemed like there were isolated instances of that. Data entry itself. 3 q, continue, improve, questions.

Chris- As far as those areas, we have strong Ethernet with large bandwidth, didn't have any problems at all. Couple of buttons that didn't work, e-mail JT about those, rest of it was good and worked fine.

Jill- Soldotna, didn't have any problems at all. Only caution, when you are downloading and printing use black and white printer, used other and couldn't make copies for them. Downloaded all student materials and protocols, printed on light grey. Didn't realize until 3-hole punched. Caution because that was a time saver.

Rachel- tremendous programs problems, but navigation not a problem. Qs: concerned about time component in math. None of things are timed, when I started this child took so much time to get started didn't have enough time to do test.

Jerry- explains timed and then use different colored pencil. Can fix directions but basically asked to switch pencils so can tell how much kid finished in one minute, then let kid keep going. Shows automation.

Rachel- easiest q is last one, many of my students stopped way before that. Wondering why doesn't progressively get more difficult.

JT- hard to do, we don't know difficulty at this level. Kids could skip problems

Pat- decisions that are in assessment now, other is about teachers and mentors having opportunity, review panels. Whether subgroup could come in and review these materials and questions, almost like separate focus group where we go page by page.

JT- did bias review, I think Aaron has some items in queue

Rachel- was on panel. After going through that I was pretty much fried. Going through test and sitting down with student was much better.

Pat- haven't heard much about online in fixes, our goal is to give ourselves to do list for 2006-7. Here's opportunity to say something you would like…..open up to topics we haven't delved into today…..if you think of something, speak up. Jerry/Aran, additional comments?

JT_ want to thank everyone for participating, know it's double duty because of other alternate assess you have been doing. We'll work real hard to make sure you don't leave so frustrated.

Rachel- done both now, much prefer this one. With much of frustrations, I think once bugs worked out will be a great test.

Jill- agree. Thanks for making these changes.

Pat- DRA and dept will review comments we've got in writing, be making to do list. Do want to mention that after this call if you think of things you wish you said, please put them in e-mail or jot down notes and let us now. You can send those to me.

Les- dir of assess and accom for state- my perception is everyone took this incredibly seriously, people have been very positive and helpful in your critiques. Trying to find assess that is more manageable in field, and is more helpful for our kids, Thank you.

Aran- if you thinks of things for training let us know. We will be training next fall. Thanks.

Summary of Focus Group Comments

The following categories and topics were addressed in the focus group. A summary of discussion points is included in the table.

TOPIC	DISCUSSION POINTS
ADMINISTRATION	
• Accommodations	More guidance is needed in both the training and the directions for test administration and scoring about the use of accommodations and modifications. Discussion included observation that students taking AA have different ways to approach accessing skill. How to determine allowable accommodations needs to be addressed in training and in trainer materials. Need to add more description that distinguishes between accommodations and modifications. Need clarification about what is being tested and whether students could use adaptive writing aids and devices to copy and write. Participants asked for a list of suggested accommodations and ways to deliver an accommodated assessment. Scoring and recording of accommodations and modifications needs more clarification. It may be helpful to produce a range of examples that explicate the principles about how to assess without changing content of what is being tested.
• Pilot Administration	Decisions and direction for recording information about Not-Administered Proficient (NA-P) and Not-Administered Inappropriate (NA-I) need clarification.
• Directions	Directions were considered clear and the decision guides were particularly helpful.
• General Comments	Preparing student materials was time consuming. Adapting materials for students with special needs was even more so. Directions for printing in black and white should be included in the download process. Colored documents do not photocopy well.
• Scoring	• More examples of judgments for correct, incorrect, and partially correct • More training and more examples on CWS & CLS • How to get and give constructive feedback on scoring for the practice administrations
MENTORING	
• Qualified Trainer	• As trainers, mentors might plan to take hard copies of materials to training sessions • Idea of focus group to discuss supports and strategies for supporting mentors as qualified trainers is a good idea for September • The how-to of training new assessors, protégés is still unclear

ONLINE SYSTEMS	
• *Connectivity*	• *I think the best information about this will come from the latest technology report from Jerry and Aaron.* • The big question is what to do about Fairbanks. How will this situation be resolved for 2006-2007 to avoid the same problem? Options = conduct isolated testing w/ Fairbanks, work directly w/ their tech folks, fix things on one end or the other (DRA, Fairbanks) or craft a work around. • Provide a clear statement of software, hardware, and bandwidth needs to operate the online systems (registration, training, proficiency, download, data entry, and reporting) maybe schedule a test period for districts with specified tasks. Maybe a check off that each has responded that things work.
• *Describe Student*	• One FG participant discussed having an opportunity to describe the student in the online system (PLEP?). • We also need to be clear about which demographic fields need to be included to make AYP work (Stdt ID, District & School ID, DOB, gender, teacher, etc.)
• *Download Videos*	• Problems with downloading videos was inconsistent, that is, problematic for some and not for others. Were problems isolated to Fairbanks or did they occur elsewhere? Need to do some testing to see if the video compression that is planned will resolve the problem. • Determine whether any of the alternatives (on CD or via pod casts) would resolve the situation, whether these solutions are feasible, and what the drawbacks are, for example, collecting data on proficiency results.
TEST DEVELOPMENT	
• *Bias Review*	• No significant comments in FG about bias review.
• *Checklist*	• Several participants thought the survey checklist was appropriate. • One wanted more discreet behaviors for communication.
• *Content Review*	• There were a series of observations about test content: • a) one case where last item on page was the easiest, • b) a suggestions was made about having a subgroup review scoring protocols and student materials and evaluate content similar to the way bias review works, • c) someone expressed concern about the timed component in the math, • Jerry- explained purpose of timed and use different colored pencil— make sure these procedures are in the administration manual and the scoring protocol. • basically switch pencils and student continues reading/writing numbers after one minute

TRAINING	
• ***2 Days w/ lab***	• there seemed to be a agreement that schedule a 2 day training with enough time in the lab to complete training and begin proficiency would work best
• ***Face to Face Training***	• Statement by one participant kind of summed it up: "The face to face training I found very good and the online training, I liked [that] I could do it in individualized chunks, and had it available to go back and refer to specific training.
• ***Online Training***	• Basically online training was viewed as effective and efficient—the concerns were raised in the connectivity section, e.g. video download • The training does take time and it was difficult to find the time to complete the training modules given the regular day to day duties pilot participants faced
• ***Practice Test***	• One participant thought the practice testing was unnecessary and testing was self-evident
• ***Proficiency Evaluation***	Several areas of concern • Proficiency exams—several pilot participants disagreed with "correct" answers in system—wanted more explanation • Administration proficiency was particularly problematic • Counting words and letters in the reading part need both more training in the training component and more explanation in the proficiency section
• ***Feedback on Scoring***	Pilot participants wanted more feedback on their scoring on student protocols

Detailed Comments from Focus Group Notes Received from Aran, Josh, and Sevrina

Steps:
- Coded comments into categories first by topic (accommodations, face-to-face training, etc.) and second by broader categories that contained multiple topics.
- Merged all notes from three recorders sans initials, headings, and side comments
- Organized comments
- Summarized major points

Category: Administration

  Topic: Accommodations

- JT--We want to access skill and they have different ways to approach accessing skill, want to be sensitive to fact there are other ways to assessing kids, want to surround it with support, examples.
- --KS, directions clear and easy to follow. Did not use Accom/Mod section with her student, but concerned about this section in training.
- --LR-gave test to high functioning, but concerned about modification, practice test overkill. Confusion on scoring some of the math – where we put the scores, some pages were different, other pages another way.
- JT – accomm vs. modif – need to add more description. Want to access the kid's skills, be sensitive that there are a lot of ways to measure the students. Add examples.
- -Terri in Ktch-student had serious fine motor needs..wishing she could accommodate, used adaptive device to write. If I could have allowed him to copy letter via device, but didn't seem to fit with the task. N for example was done by student, no reversals, so scored high, but uncomfortable with having to make these decisions.
- -?? Copper River, two kids one high one low. Lower student – would like to have had a list of suggested accommodations and ways to deliver assessment. A lot of questions on how to score different kinds of students taking the test. What to do next>
- TR-must use only accommodations that students are already in using in classroom. Don't want a laundry list of accommodations because want to see their skills at this time…Later might come up with an accommodation that could be used with this student.
- LR-need a list of acceptable accommodations so that teachers can be using.
- JT-provide a range of examples to drive the principles of how to assess without changing purpose of the test
- LR-what is an acceptable vs unacceptable accommodation just like other non-AA sped students have.
- • 		Accom/Mod concerned – too subjective – varying interfering behaviors
- • 		List of Accommodations and Modifications that administrator could use on the fly – "if student does this, then try this accom/mod"
- • 		Accommodations for instruction allowable or not allowable for assessment
- • 		examples to explain the principles better than a running list of accommodations
- Chris- part on accom/mod. St I tested I didn't use section with, but person I will be using next year I'm worried that it will be as clear.
- Linda- gave test to high functioning student, concerned about mod. Almost that the practice tests were overkill. And only concern was there was confusion on my part and Missy who gave it here, where we put the scores in, not the actual score itself, some pages were one way, some the other ways.
- Struggled with student, fine motor needs, hard to accommodate. I have him use adaptive device to write. If I could have had him copy letter, would have been a lot clearer, but didn't seem to sit with the task. Had him try to copy, it was so difficult to him; he didn't have reversals, so I scored him

well. Didn't address poorly formed letters, I made my own decisions on if this was good for him. Felt uncomfortable, more discussion would be good.

- Donna- did 2.5 kids. One low functioning, one higher. Lower functioning would like to have lists that if this happens, try this, of accom/mod that I could try. He did like it, and he poured a lot of 0's, but I kept thinking what else can I do? Qs on how to score different kinds of disabled kids.
- Terry- one of things for students required to take test, we're not supposed to provide accom if they're not using in classroom. Wondering it that's not valid for kids on this alternate assess too. Do we really want to see what their skills are at this time, and later on could come up with accom that would help them perform better, I could be wrong.
- I agree it wouldn't be time to introduce, but our state does have a list of acceptable accom teachers can use when it comes to testing time, things that are in students IEPs
- Jerry- agree; try to provide range of examples so people could understand possibilities principles behind it.
- What is acceptable, not acceptable? Be good to know.
- JT- examples to drive the principles.

Topic: Pilot Administration
- NA-I, NA-P Admin. I really struggled with, wasn't really able to figure out criteria for appropriate and not appropriate. Overall very well organized.

Topic: Directions
- -??-clear, concise, student enjoyed the test liked better than the portfolio and a camera following him around.
- --RC – like decision guide also
- Administration directions very clear and good
- Decision Points – liked
- Chris- found directions very clear, I think they were good.
- Jill- agree, looking at list didn't have opportunity because only had 1 student who did lower part of list, accommodation and modification everything went really well, enjoyable experience.
- Regina- agrees, clear and concise, student enjoyed doing it, looking at different things.
- Like decisions guides, thought that was helpful.

Topic: General Comments
- Materials Prep –Jill- I don't think this is something you should do, as a mentor I would have to suggest this to my school district.
- NA-P NA-I Confusion—struggled with Administration criteria for appropriate and inappropriate
- *Pilot Administrations:* Participating students, Administration directions, Student materials and scoring protocols, Ratings (correct, incorrect, partially correct), Standard administration issues (accom/modif, NA-I/NA-P, prompting/reinforcement, assistive technology), Survey checklist for students who cannot respond
- Printing—Jill- Soldotna, didn't have any problems at all. Only caution, when you are downloading and printing use black and white printer, used other and couldn't make copies for them. Downloaded all student materials and protocols, printed on light grey. Didn't realize until 3-hole punched. Caution because that was a time saver.
- Student materials—materials copying and cutting out was extremely time consuming
- NA-I, NA-P Confusion

Topic: Scoring

- more discussion about subjective scoring – what's appropriate and what's not – and why? (more examples would be good)
- CLS and CWS was tough – the most difficult section to teach as a trainer
- RC-part of problem with counting the words and letter sections,
- KS-the counting of spaces for letters, words, numbers. Most difficult part for trainers. Online was helpful because could review.
- TR-are you going to give us feedback on our scoring?
- Will teachers get feedback on their scoring? – Yes, we will go through them all – pink and green highlighters

Category: Mentoring

Topic: Qualified Trainer

- --concern about trng teachers on their own
- --PA-theme people anticipating the responsibility of conducting the training in districts, and fielding questions, and communicating with new assessors. Are there other thoughts about this responsibility – helpful materials?
- JR-student materials and scoring protocols. In thinking of training, recommends that trainers go into the training with hard copy manuals. Download materials, cut materials, laminate – very time consuming. Would like this information done in advance. Not something for DRA today, something for mentor and/or school district to do. Don't know when or how to do. 8 hours to make manuals and laminate, envelopes, labeled. Save a lot of time for one person to do instead of every teacher to do.
- PA-Aran and I talked about focus group continuation with mentors. Ideas for how to solve these kinds of problems. CD for printing instead of internet downloading. Plan on focus group at mentor training.
- KS-great idea. Connection
- •   Any other materials that can be provided for training?
- Pat- one other thing I heard, because we're at the beginning, I heard people anticipating conducting the training in the districts and coordinating materials, new assessors dealing with the training. Are there other thoughts people have about being responsible for training other teachers, other materials we can prepare over the summer, things we can do to conduct the training.
- Jill Rampony- don't know if 'm in the next section, student materials. In thinking of the training, what I would recommend is that person who does training, go into training with hard copy manuals of what everyone has to download. I found that time consuming, for each teacher to copy all manual, cut all flashcards, laminate flashcards, really a time consuming thing to do. What I thought, I would like to have manuals ready for everyone so they have those.
- Pat- thinking of some way to expedite the process of hands on materials.
- Pat- why don't we plan on having another focus group. How to make being a mentor feasible and doable. Any other comments about that?
- Pat- any thoughts about challenges when training others as an assessor? Being able to answer questions for others?
- Pat- any other ideas about things we can do to provide supportive materials for mentoring?
- Terry- is video component going to be part of training modules for new teachers? Is going to be used by mentors?
- Pat- need feedback from you, you would deal with assessors same way we dealt with you. Some face to face, be able to answer questions as they went through training.
- Aran- Plan is that mentors would go through same routine with teachers to bring up to qualified assessor level. Good to have in a room for part of that training. You found out how busy life gets.

Category: Online Systems

Topic: Connectivity
- be clear about connections, types of software
- Heads up that firefox worked better than dial-up. Cannot do with dialup
- Give clear access requirements
- browsers
- Access and connectivity,
- RG-tremendous problems with the program, but once in, no navigation problems
- KS-we have strong internet and large bandwidth in ASD. A few little buttons didn't work, but everything else fine.
- Chris- As far as those areas, we have strong Ethernet with large bandwidth, didn't have any problems at all. Couple of buttons that didn't work, e-mail JT about those, rest of it was good and worked fine.

Topic: Describe Student
- Terri =plep in current assessment is really good. Wanted to describe student, and would help assessment be more useful for others.
- Present Levels of Educational Performance (PLEP) component would be useful to add.
- Another thing I really liked in assess we're getting rid of, is the present levels of performance, description of the kids. That I could put down the fine motor, don't know if that would be helpful, but I felt like I wanted to be able to describe my students. Maybe that's a component that's helpful to more than just me.

Topic: Download Videos
- --EWN-liked both, could not access uncompressed video clips. Heads up that firefox worked better than dial-up. Cannot do with dialup.
- --RG-frustrated trying to download videos. Fairbanks. Our bandwidth wasn't wide enough
- -frustrated trying to download videos. Fairbanks. Our bandwidth wasn't wide enough
- compression
- Downloading videos was frustrating due to file size and bandwidth restrictions
- TR-is the video component going to be used as part of the training. Make sure some of the glitches are covered at that time. Frustrated at times, administration proficiency modules are completely unclear.
- LR-forever to download any videos in Fairbanks
- Send videos to Fairbanks and others who had trouble with videos to test the compressed videos.
- Video download/play,
- Downloading and printing,
- No problems downloading at all.
- Rachel- frustrated downloading videos. Ended up having to go to public library because our band wasn't wide enough. Don't know if anyone else had same problem.
- Regina- had some problem with videos- took a long time. Admin. Saying something was appropriate when it wasn't, I'm sure was the same concern others are referring to.
- Rebecca- I know some districts are using pod casts Videos may be put on pod cast type format, but it would still require internet.
- Jerry- what we will be doing is compressing the video files, will help solve the big problems. The admin. We've got consistent feedback something is scored wrong. Any other comments you have mark it up and send it as an e-mail and we'll try to solve it.
- Linda- took forever to download any of videos. Assuming that is being worked on.
- Terry- concern then that we take care of some of glitches with video and online training.
- RC-podcast to do training….videos may be put on podcast type format. I could research that. (videos will be compressed)
- What about podcasts for the videos?

- EW-could we burn CDs for training? Have to score a different way. Honor system?
- Can we put the training on a CD?
- Beth- I'm wondering if there's any way you can put it on a CD or set of CDs. Eliminate internet connections completely, then just have to score it some other way. Kind of be on an honor system.

Category: Test Development

Topic: Bias Review
- JT- did bias review, I think Aran has some items in queue
- Rachel- was on panel. After going through that I was pretty much fried. Going through test and sitting down with student was much better.

Topic: Checklist
- PS-did anyone use the survey checklist?
- -EW – checklist was appropriate for her student. Better than just 0 scores, checklist needs to be beefed up. Break down communication and diff skills into more discrete levels.
- PA- maybe another focus group area. Will use the checklist another year, to know how many students are out there.
- Checklist (for students who could not respond) was appropriate
- RC-survey checklist – higher functioning and works well for those students. Concerned about low-functioning. Seems there should be something more than a checklist for these students.
- How to improve the checklist? – break down into smaller, more discreet levels – way to include more advanced students
- Pat- anyone have student who could not response and use checklist.
- Beth- my student couldn't respond and thought checklist was quite appropriate.
- Pat- provided way to not score student 000
- Beth- thought is was adequate
- Pat- what kind of things are important.
- Beth- would break down communications to more discreet levels.
- Pat- might be another area for focus group. We have some ideas for improvement, so if anyone has ideas for checklist, we will be using it another year to understand students out there. Jerry/Aran, any thoughts on decisions for proficient, not proficient.
- Rebecca- add to survey check list- mine was higher functioning, I think it works well for these kids. Worried about lower functioning kids, seems like there should be something more then checklist to accommodate for those students.

Topic: Content Review
- Last item on page is the easiest. A lot of students would have stopped before that…why isn't it progressively more difficult?
- JT-need to clarify continue – how automatic is the student?
- PA – Gen assessment has content panels. It seems it might be worthwhile to have a conversation to have a subgroup of mentors to review materials and make these kinds of eligible content. Go page by page already with Bias.
- JB-Concerned about the time component in the math. None of the reg ed students are timed on anything. Why are we timed? Tasks 20 and 21
- Rachel- tremendous programs problems, but navigation not a problem. Qs: concerned about time component in math. None of things are timed, when I started this child took so much time to get started didn't have enough time to do test.

- Jerry- explains timed and then use different colored pencil. Can fix directions but basically asked to switch pencils so can tell how much kid finished in one minute, then let kid keep going. Shows automation.

Category: Training

Topic: 2 Days w/ lab--Training Combo

- --RC-combo of face to face and online worked well. I liked going through it by myself, took a lot of time, practice tests good.
- -? Face to face plus online on own, good.
- -Kris liked both face to face, individual \chunks and could go back and review. Struggled with administration. Very well done/organized otherwise.
- Katie – face to face introduction is good with online follow up.
- Initial face to face was really good – and good to work on it alone afterwards.
- like the individualized chunks
- --two days of trng, with computer lab available.
- Recommend districts do a 2-day trng, and connect it up with credit as incentive
- --then could do on a Sat
- would have been nice to have two days to do the training – credit incentive – Saturday?
- An extra day in the computer lab would be helpful

Face to Face Training

- Katy- I liked having the face to face intro, the online training I know for me and Parrish, the huge factor for us, it would have been nice for us to have a day up in Anchorage to do the training, a day away from everything to do the training.
- Regina- agreed, I liked the face to face, being able to work on it when I could
- Nebzeroff- liked the fact that we did 2 different types of training, a few of the video clips that weren't compressed, I wasn't' able to access them. You might want to double check. And heads up that fire fox worked better for a browser can't do with dial-up.
- Jill Rampony- I agree with statement it would have been nice to have 2 days to do training, I have a concern when we are training our teachers, if we just do a 1 day training and send them off, this is a lot of time to be putting in. Try to connect it up with type of credit as an incentive. Then it could be done on a Sat. also.
- Chris- The face to face training I found very good and the online training. I liked I could do it in individualized chunks, and had it available to go back and refer to specific training.
- -KN-liked face to face intor, online, for me and Snova P (unable to finish). Time was a huge factor, have a day in Anch to complete the trng.

Topic: Online Training

- -WF, online trng was effective, efficient. Able to work on it when I had time and could focus.
- --RG had trouble with some items.
- • WF: Very effective and efficient
- Wayna Freeman- really felt the online training I received was very effective for me and very efficient, I had the opportunity to work on it when I had peace and quiet and could focus and that was good.
- Rebecca- online worked well for me, good to have initial meeting, helped me to go through by myself when time allowed, did take a lot of time but practice tests were good.

- Pat- couple things I'm hearing on improvement, be clear on what works and doesn't work on software that needs to be loaded, no dial up, compress the videos.
- Pat- Time was a big factor. Hearing maybe extra day in computer lab would be part of solution, other part, was helpful to do it on own time. Connectivity with bandwidth, software. Issues we need to get answers to. Maybe some current work with computer tech group to make sure system will operate in future. That seem right?
- Beth- I'm wondering if there's any way you can put it on a CD or set of CDs. Eliminate internet connections completely, then just have to score it some other way. Kind of be on an honor system.

Topic: Practice Test

- Practice tests were unnecessary – administration was self-explanatory

Topic: Proficiency Evaluation

- On the proficiency exam, I really had a couple I disagreed with the answer. I don't know if anyone else found that. There were a couple where the administrator was clearly giving the answers and then erasing the answers for the student. When taking the test it was said that was appropriate, don't know if that's right.
- Freeman- experienced same thing (disagreed with proficiency exam), don't know if I didn't understand questions. I also disagreed with several scores the first time. Talking about the RWM
- Felt frustrated at times because admin proficiency I was giving + and – and finally just clicking on any old thing to get through it because I had no idea what would be right or wrong.
- --prof exams , disagreed with the answers (Jill ramponi): administrator clearly giving and erasing answers....appropriate
- --Jill made copies of ones she had concerns about.
- • Proficiency exam – disagreed with the answers on some for the Administration Component.
- Rebecca- part of problem of counting words and letters, reading part, I did those and it said proficient, and then not. So that's the problem I was having.
- Chris- that part where you had to do counting of spaces between and words and letters, going to be most difficult as trainers to teach that because it was hard and confusing. Online training was excellent, fact I could go back and re-do it was good, but that section as a trainer for me is going to be difficult.
- Terry- going to let us know, give us feedback on scoring?
- Jerry- yes, going through with colored highlighter to see where differences exist. We know some algorithm screwed up. Other proficiencies we'll go through with fine toothed comb so you don't have trouble when training. Videos will be pulled half size. Come summer, we might have some of you who had major problems with video downloads, try out after we fix.
  ### Topic: Scoring Feedback
- JT-yes. Pink and green highlighters

RDG	Completion/ Student ID	Student ID. Mistakes
1	18, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 2, 21, 9, 20, 4, 21, 14	11. Admin codes not indicated, 16. #2-Looks like said correct word but just speech problem should have been scored 2 or 0. 21. Marked MOD for pointing - shouldn't it be STD, 4. No problems. 21. Student is nonverbal, has no sign language. Couldn't point to picture either. There was no response. 14. I had to move hand back after each trial, wanted to play/handle flashcards, often would attempt to verbalize/model word after I said it, good attention overall.
2	18, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 2, 21, 9, 20, 4, 8, 14	11. Admin codes not indicated, 16. #4 and 5- sounds like description of picture and should have been given 1 pt., 20. Items not administered because didn't have appropriate flashcards (may have affected administration of entire test because of 3 conjecture error rule), 12. #1, 4, 5, 7, no student response w/wrong answer. 21. Marked MOD for pointing - shouldn't it be STD, 9. 2 items were not administered because did not have the appropriate flash cards (may have affected administration of entire test because of the 3 consecutive error rule-may have been able to stop administration of the task earlier). 4. Information #2 is not a symbol that is taught - I figured it out but a sped student probably wouldn't know it. 8. Said "girls" and "boys" restroom. 14. Figgety, sucking fingers, when not sucking fingers, I had to move hands back away from playing w/cards when not sucking fingers, not as interested in looking at cards as in task 1
3	18, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 2, 21, 9, 20, 4, 6, 14	3. Scores from 2 attempts, 8. Did not follow error rules (although "many" caveat), 11. Admin codes not indicated. 14. Modification results posted, 12. No total score. 21. Marked MOD for pointing - shouldn't it be STD 4. "That was easy" Lindsey's comment. 6. I should have modified this task but after I decided to come back to it she was absent. 14. After administering task-the task was presented again but this time matching flashcards presented to student 1 at a time, scored 4/8; Nina does not know her alphabet or the names of individual letters in her name though she can write her name for the most part.
4	18, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 9, 20, 4, 14	3. Total should be 5, 8. No recorded explanation on protocol for this decision. 11. Admin and filling in points tally, 20. Made significant errors (4 in a row)- 7 could have stopped test/gone to next task (student received only 2/12 points. 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 9. Made significant errors (4 in a row)-could have stopped task and gone onto the next one (total points received: 2/12), 1. #4 looks like it should have been scored for the whole 2 points if what the teacher wrote was the student's response instead of 1 point so the total should be 8/12 points instead of 7/12. 4. Memory very limited without a picture prompt. Also story needs to be shorter. Auditory memory is a real handicap for many of our students. They could answer questions on a shorter story. Beach, Shells, many students in Alaska have never seen sea shells. 14. Read more than 3 times. Accommodated by having a picture; pg 4 choices for each ? asked so could pt. to an answer, 1 pic read as correct 2 pt answer, 1 picture as a 1 pt answer; 1 [oc read as 0 pt and 1 pic read totally unrelated to story
5	18, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 1314, 16, 2, 9, 20, 14	18. didn't mark admin code, 8. No recorded explanation on protocol for this decision. 11. Admin, 12. Teacher unsure w/ scoring Item 7, I would agree w/ his decision although the directions aren't fully clear. 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 9. Marked tasks as NA-I because student knows how to read, but that means should have been marked as NA-P. 20. #4-Could that be 2/3 since 1 makes the same sound as/11/? 14. Does not have general phonemic awareness/ not accessing phonics
6	18, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 2, 9, 20, 14	8. Did not follow error rules, 11. Admin, 12. Disagree w/ scoring for Item 8 - 2/4, 16. Marked wrong admin code - should have put not admin-inapp. 12. #8 "t" not #, 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 20. #3-since n is a continuous sound, wouldn't /nn/ be correct? 14. Nina again wanted to play/handle the cards most of the time, looking around a lot as well-not very attentive to task – too difficult and behavior reflected that; not accessing phonics/no general phonemic awareness
7	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 7, 20, 5, 14, 1	11. Admin, 13. Mis-scored item #4 should be 20/25, 20. NA-I, presumably because he can read but no reason given. 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 9. NA-I presumably because the student can read but no reason is given, and if this is the reason should have been marked NA-P. 19. Not sure what to do about teacher's scoring for this task becasue it sounds like student sounded out each word correctly but then after sounding out the word, said a different word quickly. I would expect if the child was reading the word to sound out the word and then say that word again correctly. If you go by the sounding out of the words, then the student earned all 25/25 points. If you go by the words that the student produced after she sounded the words out, then the student got 12/25. The teacher gave the student a 22/25??? 5. Wow 14. No phonemic awareness/not accessing phonics. 1. I don't think scores reflex(sic) knowledge of mechanics. Student was a good guesser.
8	18, 4, 5, , 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 2, 9, 20, 5, 14	11. Admin, 16. Admin all tasks but only scored first 3 b/c all were wrong. 12. 7 should be 1pt for "sss" sound. 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 19. I'm not sure if the teacher scored some of these right because the teacher gave credit for sounds that were pronounced correctly regardless of where they occurred in the child's pronunciation. For example, child produced: 'what' for 'two'. I would score this as 0/2 because although the 't' is produced, it wasn't produced in remotely the right order. Teacher scored this 1/2. Same thing happened on Item 7. If I'm right (?), then total score should be 5/16 instead of 7/16. 1. Student said 'toope' instead of 'food'. Because student got the vowel correct, teacher should have given 1/2 points for one sound correct, but teacher scored 0/2. Total on task should be 9/16 not 8/16. 5. Good. 14. trial 1 presented w/all 8 cards on table, trial 2 presented w/3 cards at a time on table and still unable to complete (tried it just for the 'heck of it') – too difficult, trial 3 when shown picture cards for objects above (dime, food, #2) she was able to pt. to correct picture from a verbal request for 3/3.

9	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 20, 2, 9, 20, 14	4. #5-8 didn't score for ANY correct sound, didn't mark admin. Code, 11. Admin, 16. Admin all tasks but only scored first 3 b/c all were wrong. 20. Skipped task and marked it inappropriate when skill in fact is appropriate - could have marked w/a-p. Decision point- should have continued administration? Student did really well on some tasks and really poorly on others. 12. 3 should be 1pt for sound, 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 20. when/then-last sound is the same, should be 1 point. 19. Item 2 and item 3 should be givem 0/2 points instead of 1/2 so total should be 5/16 rather than 7/16. 14. Way to difficult – administered standard first and then modified- she does know the color blue from color choices and what a piece of paper is
10	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 9, 20, 14	11. Admin 14. Stopped administration, 20. Administrator says no cards matched assessment protocol/scoring. 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 9. Administrator says no cards matched the scoring guide. 1. Teacher added up total points wrong so total should be 9 instead of 8/17. This doesn't affect decision point because student scored at least 8 points. 14. Way to difficult, cannot read – administered standard 1st and then modified
11	4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 20, 2, 9, 20, 4, 12, 22	18. just level 1 and 2, 4. All paragraphs put cw/m and tw/min in wrong spot, simple paragraph and level 1, 5. Did not mark errors or use correction notation for timed reading. 11. Admin, 12. Is this scored correctly since the student finished in 25 sec? (Simple paragraph), Also, looks like CW/min = 77 for Level 1. 12. 6 errors not 5, did not fill out level 2 score. 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 20. Recording of cwpm and total words per-minute- wouldn't 27 total words- 8 errors = 19 correct words per minute? Because only scored 19/27 cwpm, shouldn't have administered task 11. See concerns about #11 above regarding scoring calculation. 4. Should not be timed. 12. E. finished reading this in 25 sec. 22. Had to point to each word, so student could follow the story line. The student became frustrated.
12	4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 20, 2, 9, 20	18. level 2 - didn't record total points, level 1 6/6, level 2 6/6, 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 1. Teacher wrote "student refused to read" so I'm not sure how this should be checked. The standard box is checked for the first passage and the "Inappropriate task" is checked for the second passage. Nothing is noted about why the student didn't read the 2nd passage, maybe the student refused this too?
General Comments		6. Missing skill indicated for bottom set extended reading protocol pg. 2, Pg. 3 #3-scoring 0 not 2, pg. 4 # 3-0 not 2, stopped at task 7, 14. Good comments on how to adapt tasks for life-skills children. 12. All- did not check mod-cr response code. 19. No prerequisite skills boxes checked to know which skills student had.

WRT	Completion/ Student ID	Student ID. Mistakes
1	18, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 21, 9, 8, 14	3. Is it appropriate to provide letters to trace? Modification? 11. Admin codes; some student responses not given, 12. I would give TOTAL score of 19/20 (teacher left blank w/?) 8. Needed to have exemplar on other side because he is left-handed. 14. After 1st 3 letters w/no assistance, provided a model of each letter 1 at a time for student to trace (no assist on tracing);….likes to use a pencil, completed task eagerly, close approximation or a (in both her name), W close as well.
2	18, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 21, 9, 8, 14	3. Is it appropriate to provide letters to trace? Modification? 11. Admin. 8. Fine motor issues. Not using lines. Still left-handed issues with exemplars. 14. Modifications: Provided a model to trace with no assistance after unable to complete 1st 4 words on own, I said each letter as she traced them, close approximation on only letter h t noted; Comments; still eager to complete writing activity w/pencil
3	18, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 16, 21, 9, 5, 4, 8, 14	18. Incorrect CLS, should be 19, 3. Is it appropriate to provide letters to trace? Modification? 5. No student responses, 8. I would have scored very differently, Item 1: CLS 2, Total CLS 11, % Correct 18%; Item 2: CLS 10, Total CLS 16, % Correct 63%; Item 3: CLS 3, Total CLS 23, % Correct 13%; Task 4: CLS 15, Total CLS 50, % Correct 30%, 11. admin, 12. score differently, Item 1 -8 for CLS, Item 2 -14 for CLS, 16. #3- think scored incorrect sequence when I don't see why. 19. Does not contain percentages correct for items 1-3. Item 1 should be 91%. Item 2 should be 100%. Item 3 should be 100%. 5. Why in the world would you need % here? It seems random. 4. Scoring made sense when I understood it. 8. Handwriting very affected by fine motor. Had trouble seeing the exemplar sentences as hand moved across sheet. 14. After standard admin. for 1st 2 sentences, I provided a model to trace of 3rd sentence, is (sp) 2 words only, saying f pointing to each letter in the sentence as she traced it, I continued supping and pointing to letter in has big spots (no tracing model provided) but she chose to write her last name; Wrote her name for 1st 2 sentences. Still eager to complete written tasks.
4	18, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 21, 9, 8, 14	3. Is it appropriate to provide letters to trace? Modification? 5. No student responses, 8. Why didn't she have him use assisted?; scoring: 1/6, 1/7=2/13, 11. Admin, 12. Didn't fill in # pnt./possible, 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 9. Unsure about #2-correct letter sequences but wrote whole name instead of just last name as directions requested. 20. #2: Should be 4/8 instead of 5/8? 8. Drew his own lines. Wrote 1st name both times. Uses only lower case. 14. After standard admin. I did provide her a model to trace – really perseverated (sp) on I's (dotting them) on model; Continues to perseverate on dotting I's, always remembers that accent mark over lower case n (taught by mom to do that) appeared angry when asked to trace name after she wrote on her own.
5	18, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 9, 8, 14.	18. Miss score on CLS, 3. Is it appropriate to provide letters to trace? Modification? 5. No student responses for incorrect responses #1 and 8. 11. Admin, 12. #7-1CLS no 0. 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 8. Struggled. Erased a lot; may have been copying the words at the top. 14. model to trace provided for all words; way too difficult/unable to do without model, no physical assistance given while tracing model; should be able to NA-I on this task
6	18, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 9, 4, 14	18. #2 -Calculated 13 CLS's but scored 14 #3-I calc is not 14, 3. Is it appropriate to provide letters to trace? Modification? 8. why weren't any modifications attempted? 11. Admin, didn't record %, 13. (This is being real nit-picky) recording points in CLS column, 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 20. Have to assume scoring is correct because no student probe included. 19. Total percentage should be 3.5% correct rather than 35%. 4. Figuring percentage for each item seems a waste of time. 14. Way too difficult, unable to do without the model, no physical assistance given while tracing model; Should be able to NA-I on this task
7	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 2, 9, 3, 14	8. why weren't any modifications attempted? 11. Admin, 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 20. No scoring errors- have to assume is correct. 3. Not sure how to proceed with modifications beyond this point to task 10. 14. Instead of circling answer for student and having her trace circle- I made flashcard of the correct word/mark and while blocking out the rest of the text around boxed word choices, had her select word that matched the correct word flashcard I showed her.; way too difficult; should be able to NA-I on this task
8	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 4, 14	18. Incorrect CLS - should be 11 not 16 and incorrect total CLS possible - should be 15. 8. why weren't any modifications attempted? 11. Admin, 12. Didn't record %, 13. I calculated a different score 31/39, 79%, 16. Did not mark admin code. 12. No score or sentences but student materials. 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 20. Have to assume scoring is correct because no student probe included. Questions about sentence written in comments box because that sentence is correct and has more words than those recorded. 1. Student did not think of a response so the 0 score might be reflective of student's inability to think of response rather than ability to formulate sentences. 4. I like the way this is scored. 14. Nisa has a folder containing several different topics she can "write" on thru the use of Pix Writer (picture/text reading software program). She selected her like folder and her sentence is attached (no assistance). We did a few minutes reviewing the items/words/actions she had to choose from on this page before she "typed" her sentence, word and punctuation are included on her options to choose from
9	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 16, 9, 5, 4	18. Total CWS poss. I think is incorrect - I got 20, 8. Should have marked skipped, why weren't any modifications attempted? 11. Admin, 12. Didn't record %, 14. Stopped testing. 16. Did not mark admin code. 12. Missing, 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 9. Questions about scoring accuracy. 1. Teacher marked "modified" but task should be marked 'skipped'. 5. Student wrote random words, not scorable in my opinion. 4. Didn't see the qualitative guide in the training.

10	18, 4, 7, 11, 13, 14, 16, 11, 22	18. Incorrect CWS - should be scored 2. Didn't score ideas or org. or fill iin total scores. 5. Student chose not to complete?? Not marked for response code/admin code. 8. why weren't any modifications attempted? 11. Admin skipped, 18. I think the teacher may have allowed under 10min (11:33- 1 circled), wouild that be considered modification? I would have scored this task differently based on the rules. FORCE PERIODS into the run0on according to directions! 16. Did not mark admin code. 12. missing, 21. Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 19. Teacher marked 'NA-I' but should have marked 'skipped' because student could not write a sentence in task 8. 1. Teacher marked 'not administered: inappropriate' but should be marked 'skipped'. 11. Skipped. 22. Student could not write his own story.
General Comments		4. Didn't have student samples to check CLS or CWS. 7. No student materials so had to assume CLS and CWS was correct, 19. No prerequisite skill boxes checked on general instructions page. 1. No requisite skills are noted on the General Instructions page so we don't know what types of skills the student has. Teacher administered the test though. 6. No scoring packet received.

MATH	Completion/ Student ID	Student ID. Mistakes
1	18, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 21, 15, 9, 20, 14	8. Be consistent in recording points (e.g. '0' or '1' not -), 11. Admin- response format did not fill in naming for sign language or admin code - STD, No admin code marked. 14. Quick responses, in class working on identifying #'s up to 20 (firm on 0-15)
2	18, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 21, 15, 9, 20, 4, 8, 14	8. Why not use assisted copy? I would have scored Item #7 as 0/6, 11. Did not record student response, 16. #6 and 7- thought graded too hard, I would have scored higher. 4. The 4 should be open. 8. Fine motor issues. Left-handed issues. 14. Needed to remind her to hold pencil correctly at start of activity by holding the eraser
3	18, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 21, 15, 9, 20, 3, 4, 6, 14	8. Comments say he guessed but objectively, mm got item #7 correct, 4/8 total, 11. Did not indicate response, Marked MOD for pointing - shouldn't it be STD?, 3. Not sure how to modify this one. Not good directions on this one. 4. The task was fine. 6. DK= "don't know" 14. Became real distracted after item 3 – too difficult
4	18, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 15, 9, 20, 12, 14	8. Stopped due to errors, Didn't fill in #of total points. 11. Admin codes, student response not indicated. 19. For all single digit numbers, student responds by writing a 1 in front such as '14' for '4'. Should this be counted as partially right? Directions don't say but teacher gave 0/2 for each item. If it can have partial credit, then #2, #5, #7, and #9 should all have 1/2 instead of 0/2 and total score should be 22/44 instead of 18/44. 1. Student wrote '17' for '79' and teacher scored as '0' although student should be given 1 point for writing 7 correctly. So total should be 15/44, not 14/44. 12. Although the answer by this student was still wrong, the shapes all measure to be rectangles. None of them are square. I found #4 unanswerable. Needs to be reviewed - It is confusing. Attached note: these are not accurate; my student could not tell for sure. When I measured them later...none of them measure as squares. 14. Provided model to trace (dotted lines), no physical assist provide in tracing #'s – also showed 2 sets of # cards to have her match-scored 3/10 correct -8/6/4; enjoys pencil writing tasks; too difficult (# & writing)
5	18, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 2, 15, 9, 20, 4, 14	11. Admin codes not given, 12. #3 drew left arrow but no points. 4. No problems 14. Not interested in flashcards, wanted to play w/objects, needed lots of redirecting to task
6	18, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 15, 9, 20, 4, 14	11. Admin codes not given, 12. Check out the note from teacher. 4. It measured the correct concept. 14. No interest, way too difficult
7	18, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 15, 9, 20, 14	11. Admin codes, 12. No score (total). 14. Item 9 seems out of place here; used Dynamo communication device for "verbal" response – part of her current IEP program goals/objectives
8	18, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 15, 9, 20, 12, 14, 22	8. NA-I (comments say 'non-verbal' but couldn't modifications be made?)11. Admin codes, 12. See teacher's comments, 9. Gave point for incorrect total, but did not include it in total. 3. Seasonal pictures were from our calendar time. 12. The pictures are difficult to figure out and in Alaska, there is not a star or moon visible at night in the summer :) 14. Covered up pictures on card so only 1 visible at a time – had a separate pg w/ 3 pics. on it morning- daytime-nighttime for student to pt to when presented w/flash card picture. 22. Lots of prompts.
9	18, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 15, 9, 20, 14	11. Admin codes. 14. Wanted to matched # cards to # line, way to difficult
10	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 9, 20	5. #1, 11. Admin codes
11	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 9, 20	11. Admin codes
12	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 9, 20	11. Admin codes
13	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 9, 20	11. Admin and student scoring 0/5 - 1/5, 20. #2 scored incorrectly - should be 0/1 points; changes total to 2/5.
14	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 9, 20, 2, 4	11. Admin and student scoring, 2/7-3/7, 2. Bad question. Very difficult wording to understand. 4. Tester need to realize that this is a continuous problem. Should be emphasized in training.
15	18, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 15, 9, 20	18. No response format, 11. Admin, 12. No score (total). 19. Response format box not checked.
16	7, 13, 14, 15, 9, 20	5. Didn't tell actual student response, 13. I wonder if he prompted when no response was given for items 4 and 5? -no comments. 12. No score (total). 20. Only one problem correct-total should be 1, not 2.
17	18, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 9, 20, 4	18. No admin code, 5. No student responses, 7. See modification. 12. No score (total). 4. I had difficulty scoring while working with the child. Had to stop and think.
18	18, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 9, 20	18. Didn't mark score on #3, 12. No score (total).
19	18, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 9, 20, 18	12. No score (total). 18. Electronic has 8 total possible on item #2.
20	18, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 9, 20, 5, 4	18. Miss scored - should be 29/30 correct digits, 12. No mod or response format checked. 5. Confusion to score. 4. Too many problems on this page- what about methods of progressively getting harder. Item 20 is the easiest, yet it is last. Lindsey gave up long before this point. The general ed. Population is not timed, why would we time special needs students. (no st #). Student has C.P. (cerebral palsy?) which make timed

		writing difficult. Therefore, not appropriate, could to task if it was untimed.
21	18, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 9, 20, 5, 4	18. No admin code, 12. No mod or response format checked. 20. Marked administration scoring code as Standards but no time or score recorded - should be NA-I? 5. Confusion to score, where to we mark them? 4. Should not me timed! Is it necessary to put this many items on a page to assess this skill. Again, there doesn't appear to be an order to the placement of items on this task. Student just shut down when she saw the page. I tried 2 times. (no st #). Student has C. P. and finds it very difficult to write while being timed- could do all of these if task was un-timed.
22	18, 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 9, 20, 22	18. No admin code #4 - scored incorrect, should be 1/2, #5 - scored incorrect, should be 1/2, 12. I would score item #6 differently (1/2); one digit is correctly placed. 12. No mod or response format checked. 9. Didn't write scores on scoring sheet or total. 22. Task given- unknown amt completed.
General Comments		3.Trace modification like in writing, 4. No student materials, 6. Scoring pg. 4, total 4/24. Testing stop at item 7. 21. Task 4-22: Didn't mark admin code on any of these tasks. 1. Tasks 19, 20, 21, and 22, teacher checked 'not administered inappropriate' but it is unclear why.

Red – Practical issue to be addressed by DRA

Black – Policy issue to be addressed by EED

Blue – Both practical and policy to be worked out in conjunction with DRA and EED

Yellow – Clarifying Questions between reviewers

Green – Comments from Aran

Purple – **Les' comments.**

Test Administration/Teacher Commitment	
Should the test administrator make a verbal response as the student answers the questions? Example: "Good" when the student selects correct response. Doesn't seem right to do this.	Amount of time (trainings, etc.) that a teacher will need to commit to this? Districts will need to know. *Should DRA describe the amount of training required to become a proficient assessor?*
Is there funding to pay for subs? Our district does not allow SPED or other trainings because of the cost of training/subs. I am concerned that this will take a full day – not one hour after school. **DTCs are allowed time to train proctors, associate test coordinators, and other test administers. The same should hold true for special educ training.** **We need to be careful that we don't direct how a district spends money. Might be best to indicate that it is a local responsibility to test students based on state and federal law. It is important to work with the director of special education in each district to determine how to secure the time for testing.**	Does the test have to be administered by the student's teacher/case manager? **Currently under discuss ion. Student's teacher is preferred. Propose that districts may apply for an Alternative Qualified Assessor, such as a paraprofessional with teaching certificate, or highly-qualified paraprofessional who has been certified by QT as proficient.**
Can we do "Qualified Trainer" before the end of May in order to be ready for next Fall? **No, QA level only**	Everyone administering must be a qualified assessor. Do we send more than one person for the fall training? **EED will pay for one Mentor (QT) per district (Anchorage sends more depending on room, Fairbanks gets 3, MatSu 3 depending on room). Can QT train Assoc QTs?**
Can there be more than one test administrator? (Ex.: Classroom teacher and Special Education teacher split tests/items over a period of time → Gen. Ed: All math, ½ reading. Spec. Ed.: All writing, ½ reading).**Need to discuss. Prefer one assessor, if not the student's teacher, possible to require teacher do read-behinds?**	Who administers the test? Some students spend most of their day in the SPED room, and it would make sense that they're tested by the SPED teacher. I have a student who is in the gen. Ed. Classroom the entire day (w/a 1:1 aid) and has a 30 minute reading pull out. Who tests him? When? If I am to test him, do I hire a sub? **Test administrators are trained by a Qualified Trainer and are certified as a Qualified Assesor. The person who gives the assessment must be familiar with the student's communication/response mode.**
How long does it take to get proficient (for teachers)?	How long does it take to administer the test?
What words is the QA allowed to say? Good? Thank you? Anything at all? Seems like the answer would be no additional prompts?	

Technical Difficulties	
I clicked on the back arrow and somehow my proficiency disappeared. I know that I passed, but now it says I didn't. What happened?	I double clicked on something and it screws it up. Why?
It says "Click on the play button" for the training pages, but it doesn't say "play" anywhere.	You might need to see if this site needs to be given preference in a district's router, so it doesn't compete head to head with some kid "researching Eminem" **This is a DRA technical question it seems**
Website/Program Questions/Suggestions	
Need a response "You have successfully submitted"	What is the "Help Desk" number?
Can the standards be uploaded into Goalview or other IEP systems in time for next year?	Do we need to print off everything? **No, need the scoring protocols and student materials. Manual?**
Regarding copy numbers: Directions for scoring unclear.	Can any of the SPED teachers from my school sign on as a new user and begin the online training? **No**
Proficiency	
Where are you going to get the beginning criteria which will show proficiency? **Do not understand question**	This is a very interesting test – how do you determine proficiency?**At a standard-setting committee after the first full implementation in 2007.**
If I stop assessment at Task 8 (in math for example), will tasks 9-22 count against the student's overall proficiency in math? **I recall Jerry saying the denominator is the same as the number of items used with student, so No. JT?**	
Proficiency Descriptors/Standards	
How are the entry Points different from the scaffolding already in the Proficiency Level Descriptors – from Advanced to Far Below Proficiency? Can you use some of that work**? Unclear question. Early Entry Points? OR ExGLEs? Proficiency Descriptors include some, but not all of the ExGLEs for a specific grade.**	Based on Proficiency Descriptors, does a student need to do all the tasks? In SBA, grade 3 student (advanced) doesn't go onto grade 4. **DRA? My understanding is that a student is supposed to go until they can't. This will help an IEP team determine if a student should be taking the AA or SBA with accommodations.**
Grade 5 & 6 Reading – Proficiency Level Descriptors -- rather than "reads simple sigh words," change to "reads simple words." Usually sight words refer to "Dolch sight words" some of our kids can read family names, friends names, etc., but not so many "sight words."	If we are writing IEPs this Spring, are there specific standards that we should be adding? **ExGLEs**

Students Labeled Severe/Profound	
This test seems to reach a higher level of functionality than we went to for the portfolio. Is it possible that those lowest students who take the regular tests w/their peers will now have a more appropriate test? (ex: mild MR, lower LD). Conversely, this test does not reach the lowest level/most involved student. Some students may not be able to access this new test. This seems like we need to do some very good training. I think those in the lowest group of the regular assessment must continue with that assessment if they have been taking it, unless they are severely cognitively disabled. If they can take the regular test with accommodations, keep them there. We may need to discuss lower level items or how we can do a quick check of low proficiency levels using a quick check tool of some type.	When will we know what the test for the most severely impacted students will be? I assumed this was it, but we better be talking.
What do you do about students who cannot do any party of the test (e.g., those who are not at a level where they can make a yes or no response by pointing, gazing, etc, or identify people/objects).	What kind of assessment will that group who remain below proficient (in grades 3-4) all their lives receive?
Will the test address severe/profound?	
Negative Comments	
Very demoralizing to teachers to have a student who will never be proficient, always non-symbolic, but could learn tons, including the most important thing – communication. Perhaps we can work on what we call the proficiency levels, but when it comes to real academic skills, this may be true.	How awful for the country and the state to set up systems for SPED students to once again be told "you are not good enough" – and will never be. Let's work on the labels.
Miscellaneous Questions/Comments	
You did a nice job of explaining the ExGLE as a tool for teachers to access that standards (Grade Level). This will be very important for all teachers. Is there a way to build into the training module so we can ensure they (teachers) read it? I really think it needs to be presented in more than an introduction.	How were the local (L) items determined that would not be tested? **Local items were determined by committees who developed the PS/GLEs.**
Will we be writing Alternate Assessment goals like we do now? **IEP teams will not use the Alternate Performance Standards as they have in the past.**	Math – Count Money, 1 pt for "identifies amounts" – at least once
Word "Care", say "Can" get 1 pt.?	

General Test Questions	
How does each teacher get his or her own testing materials? **Download from web site. A district may decide to download, print, and distribute to teachers who need the materials**.	What will be put on the assessment portion of the IEP? **Alternate Assessment**
Some people think that this test is being tried out and that we might now actually use it. Is that the case? **This is the Alternate Assessment that will be used in school year 2006-2007. The items will change.**	Is there a paper record form so teachers can write answers if they want and transfer to the computer later?
6 week window 3/1 – 4/13/06	Does everyone who administers the test have to be a "qualified trainer"? **Must be a Qualified Assessor**
It will take time to do adapt & mod. Development. How will we get the time? Ideas? How will we know what's valid? **Do not understand if this question relates to instruction or assessment.**	How do people request a paper/pencil version? Should we try one during pilot? How to ship? Who to request one from? *This one should probably be blue. There is a policy piece and a budget piece potentially.*
Are requirements changing to be on AA? (to include higher students) Many of the students I have that would do well on this test are on the regular assessment especially in the lower grades. **No, the contract is for an Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. State law uses the term "significant cognitive disabilities" but it includes students "with the most significant.." which is the USDOE terminology.**	Why isn't the video samples of assessors giving assessments using generally accepted best practice test administration? Example- no use of "good" "thank you" ect.
I had kind of understood that the "pilot" part of this was just to set cut-offs and such, not to determine if the test would be used. The only think that might change is if an item shows bias for our population, right? **This is the new test format for the Alternate Assessment. Items will change annually. The Bias committee also examines items for bias and that could change an item.**	I cannot, philosophically, direct a parent to choose or support a non-diploma track for their child. These children have accomplished everything we (IEP team) have asked, and deserve a diploma. What can I do? **Selecting the appropriate program and assessment for a student is an IEP team decision. The IEP team will refer to the Participation Guidelines and other criteria available on the AA website to determine a student's program and assessment.** **The issue is one around a state statute, and if the student can't take the regular assessment and can't take the HSGQE, they can't get a diploma by state law.**
Need examples of NA-1 other than deaf student.	

Modified Questions	
What does modified administration mean? Is this invalid?	Are there scoring protocols for modifications and accommodations?
Please elaborate on the difference between accommodation and modification. This needs to get crystal clear in participation guidelines – don't you think?	Modified on HSGQE = diploma. This is only partially true. A student must first take the test in their 10th grade year not modified. If they take a test modified 3-10 it is invalid and not good for AYP. The modified for the HSGQE is for students who re-take the exam under the alternative assessment program. This is a legal issue. Why does modify = 0 on alternate?
So, those who are given modified tasks will not "pass"? The non 1-2% taking HSGQE and receiving modifications can "pass" and receive credit towards diplomas! **Modifications on the SBAs result in invalid test scores also.** **The re-take only can take modified, first time HSGQE students can't.**	Allowing the students their usual and customary response form, if different from typical response form, is an accommodation or modification?
Who makes the decision about whether something in an accommodation or a modification and is there a mechanism for checking testing reliability?	
Test Bias Questions	
On the math # writing subtest, why do you use the "4" rather than "4" as we generally write it? Don't' know what this means.	Are there considerations for signs & labels regarding cultural? School bus = no exposure Walk = no exposure Don't walk = no exposure What grade level are we talking? Exposure live or exposure through culture experiences such as books and TV. If this is an upper grade then I don't see this as bias, but if it is a lower grade it could be an issue.

Student Communication Tools	
For pre-symbolic students can we use objects? (real pictures)	What is determinating the sight words for 5/6? Where do the words come from? Will teachers get the list?
Where are the sight words pulled from? Can we provide this info to teachers?	I don't think that grammar conventions should be bundled with word sequencing. (Rule 6)
Assisting technology for writing – Can students write with computer/write-out-loud/spell check? Many students can express more complex ideas with technology.	For identifying pictures section in reading – it would be nice if words listed were ones that could be shown or available as actual objects to present to kids who need 3D and not a flat flashcard/line drawing.
Under prerequisite Skills: Extended Reading Scoring Protocol, does "Skill – Blink / Nod mean in response to a question/request? All students blink, many nod-but not in a meaningful communication mode.	
State Funding Questions	
Will the state fund laser printers and provide ink, ect. For assisting in cost of printing protocols and such? **Not at this time. Let's discuss what we can do to support. We can't buy printers and ink, but we could provide copies of some of the documents if that would help.**	Is the state going to fund technology upgrades for all districts in Alaska in order to use this assoc format? **Special Education has already provided funds for upgrading computer systems and internet access. Same as the answer to the left.**
AYP and Assessment Questions	
If a student is NA-I does that count for or against AYP participation? I don't know what NA is. If a student participates in a subtest then they have participated, we need to identify what a participant is. On the regular test it is any student who has completed five or more problems I think.	What will this test do to AYP, especially at smaller schools? Just as always no more than 1% can be considered proficient on this exam for the purpose of AYP. While more can be proficient, when calculating AYP the proficiency is capped at 1%. I would anticipate fewer would be proficient on this exam as it will be a greater reflection of academic knowledge.
What about all the BP scores doe to students with multiple disabilities who cannot take this new A.A.? AYP scores well effect school rating- All students must be assessed. I thought this was a contract to accommodate the alternate population???	

Students with limited mobility Questions	
How to access a student w/ cognitive abilities less than one year and motor deficits limited to only head movement?	How will I assess a 12 year old with an estimated cognitive level of 6-9 mos.?
All task require students to have symbolic systems of communication, written and oral. How do we assess the non-symbolic population?	I think this will push the teachers of primarily orthopedic MD students with AAC devices to teach content. This is good. Will not be applicable to sever MD, pre-symbolic, pre-intentional communicators. It is not good to reach content?
If a student does not have to be in regular classroom to work on content, then why do students who are not working on standards need to be in the regular class doing non-standards when they might be better off in other place learning what they need to learn? *This one seems like a placement policy question that belongs in the special education office not in assessment or DRA.*	